

**Draft Summary of the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
April 24, 2003**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted a meeting for the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group on April 24, 2003 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary:

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Flip Chart Notes
Attachment 4	Recreation Needs Analysis Study PowerPoint Presentation
Attachment 5	Draft Geographic Reaches for Purposes of Resource Action Decisions

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations and the desired outcomes of the meeting were discussed. The meeting agenda (listing desired outcomes) and list of meeting attendees are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Meeting flip chart notes are included as Attachment 3.

Action Items – March 27, 2003 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting

A summary of the March 27, 2003 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

Action Item #R61:	Arrange for public workshop to provide guidance on completing Resource Action Information Form. Notice workshop electronically to all of the collaborative's work group distribution lists.
Status:	The participants were informed that Rick Ramirez, Program Manager with DWR is considering the format and timing for a workshop. Doug Rischbieter, Recreation and Socioeconomics Resource Area Manager with DWR will follow up on this action item for next month's meeting.
Action Item #R62:	Develop matrix for organizing PM&E proposals and identify "chart-toppers". Fill in matrix with proposals already identified (from SD1, Issue Tracker, JPA document) for at least one of the geographic areas.
Status:	This item was discussed in the context of the meeting agenda items addressing the development and tracking of PM&Es. Please refer to the summary below.
Action Item #R63:	Identify appropriate meeting types, locations, and durations to achieve near-term objectives for PM&E development.
Status:	This item was discussed during the discussion of "next steps" at the end of the meeting. Please refer to the summary below.

The Facilitator informed the participants that the Environmental Work Group is farthest along in terms of the development and tracking of potential PM&E measures or resource actions. They organized the resource actions into geographical sub-areas of the Project and now have begun

discussions of the potential actions as they relate to resource goals. They are planning to use task forces to further develop the proposals.

Needs Analysis Update

Chuck Everett with EDAW provided an update on SP-R17 (Recreation Needs Analysis) via a PowerPoint presentation (see Attachment 4). Because this study is dependent on results from the other recreation studies, his presentation focused on the steps and the inter-dependencies between studies that are required for the development of a recreation needs assessment. He explained how this assessment, which is required by FERC, will form the basis of the Recreation Plan that will be developed for the Project but noted that the Needs Analysis is not the recreation plan itself. Please refer to Attachment 4 for more detailed information.

The participants discussed the Needs Analysis and the timing of results from other studies. Chuck noted the draft interim report for SP-R17 would consist of an annotated outline because the complete set of data will not be available from the other studies. DWR pointed out that participants have access to the data developed for the Needs Analysis through the individual recreation study reports that are distributed to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group. The Needs Analysis will integrate qualitative data (e.g., “what people say”) and empirical/quantitative data derived from the surveys. Population growth projections will be used in SP-R12 (Projected Recreation Use), which will feed into the Needs Analysis. In terms of projected use, recreation trends will be considered. One participant pointed out that hunting/fishing trends are not necessarily indicative of population trends because they are tied to regulatory mechanisms that may be affecting use. It was suggested that trail impacts should be evaluated after wet weather conditions.

Framing the PM&E Discussion

In an effort to frame the discussion of PM&Es, the Facilitator distributed a handout detailing the geographic reaches of the Project, which represent various sub-areas of the Project and areas that extend beyond the Project boundary (see Attachment 5). The geographic reaches allow for more focused development of PM&Es and can be used as an organizational tool to track these measures. Eight reaches have been identified: (1) Diversion Pool; (2) Low Flow Section; (3) Oroville Wildlife Area; (4) Thermalito Afterbay; (5) Thermalito Forebay; (6) Oroville Reservoir; (7) Upstream Tributaries; and (8) the Feather River below Thermalito Outlet.

The participants discussed the breakdown of these geographic reaches. Participants agreed to move the Fish Barrier Dam/Pool to the Diversion Pool reach. There was a proposal to develop an “Other” category for facilities that spanned several reaches (e.g., canals), and an “Overall” category for items that did not fit into one of the reaches identified; the participants subsequently agreed that the Thermalito Power Canal would be included with the Forebay area and the Thermalito Powerplant Tailrace would be included in the Afterbay area. There was another suggestion to create a category for “lands with nexus to the project,” which may include private mines that extend to the lakeshore. One participant suggested the relicensing process should consider federal lands in the project area that are managed for recreation. The participants agreed that the geographic categories developed are flexible, and may change if necessary as the process evolves.

PM&E Discussion

At the March Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting, DWR was charged with developing a matrix that lists known proposed resource actions and criteria to track and evaluate these actions. DWR completed this task for two geographic reaches – the Diversion Pool and Thermalito Forebay. The list of resource actions was derived from the Issue Tracker, the JPA list, and public input. The column headings or “chart-toppers” include suggestions from the March Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting and JPA information. The Facilitator noted that this process is analogous to the process used by the Environmental Work Group, but it includes considerably more proposed resource actions to consider. There was a suggestion to

post PM&Es on the Website as the process progresses. DWR indicated that this is not feasible because each work group is compiling and revising their own list and they are very fluid. The DWR RAMS are developing a method to compile a master list to identify potential conflicts and/or mutual benefits between resource areas.

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group discussed the preliminary matrix developed by DWR. The column headings included: resource action number, interest addressed, description, P/M/orE, local priority, tourism priority, flow-related, construction, O&M, enforcement, environmental documentation, potential for cross-resource impacts, potential user conflicts, change in experience/expectation, and a column for comments. The participants suggested the following additional column headings: need for acquisition/right-of-way; direct revenue generation (which would represent fee-based actions as opposed to items that could indirectly result in economic benefits to the community); ADA compliance; and compatibility with local/regional plans.

The discussion then focused on the relationship between the matrix and the needs assessment. In theory, the needs assessment is captured in the column identifying the action as a protection, mitigation, or enhancement measure. All actions in the matrix will be considered in the context of the needs assessment. The matrix is not intended to screen resource actions out of consideration because all actions may be considered in the settlement agreement. A range of resource actions is important to evaluate when developing a range of alternatives for the environmental review process. The participants agreed that the "P/M/orE" column should not be filled out until the Recreation Needs Analysis has developed at least some preliminary information.

The participants worked on filling in the matrix for several resource actions and realized the difficulty of completing the matrix due to the lack of detail about the resource actions. The participants agreed that the items in the matrix need to be pulled together and defined better, and it is important to be able to backtrack to the original issue. A proposal was made to have DWR define the actions better and make an initial attempt at filling in the matrix, and then bring it back to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group for discussion. The participants suggested DWR use a low-medium-high classification in the matrix as opposed to simply checking the box and develop alternatives if appropriate.

The status of the current recreation plan for Lake Oroville was discussed. DWR's version of the plan can be provided to interested participants upon request and is available in the Project's reference libraries in Oroville, Red Bluff, and Sacramento. The existing Lake Oroville State Recreation Area (LOSRA) General Plan by Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) is also available in the Project's reference libraries. A Relicensing goal is to achieve consistency between DWR's new Recreation Plan and DPR's General Plan; the latter is capable of amendment if necessary and appropriate.

Next Steps

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed on the following meeting date/time:

Date: Thursday, May 22, 2003
Time: 6:00 to 10:00 PM
Location: Kelly Ridge Golf Club

It was noted that DWR is planning a modeling workshop for June that will focus on the operations models and benchmark run results. Another workshop is being planned for the late summer to discuss data outputs and determine future model run scenarios.

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and due date.

Action Item #R64: Consolidate issues and PM&Es into resource actions, tracking how individual items are combined.

Responsible: DWR

Due Date: May 22, 2003

Action Item #R65: Provide update on interim projects.

Responsible: DWR

Due Date: May 22, 2003

Action Item #R66: Revise "Geographic Area Descriptions" to reflect tonight's discussions.

Responsible: DWR

Due Date: May 22, 2003

Carry-over Action Item

Action Item #R61: Arrange for public workshop to provide guidance on completing Resource Action Information Form. Notice workshop electronically to all of the Colloborative's work group distribution lists. (Follow-up action item)

Responsible: DWR

Due Date: May 22, 2003